Serial No. 09/661,930
Group Art Unit: 3714

REMARKS

A Request for Continued Examination has been filed concurrently with this Response. Claims 15-26, and 30 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to refile these or similar claims in a continuing application. Claims 33-43 have been newly added. Claims 1, 5, 6, 11 and 27 have been amended. In particular, the limitations from claim 30 have been incorporated into claim 27. Editorial revisions have been made to claims 1, 5, 6, and 11. Claims 1-14, 27-29, and 31-43 are pending in this application. Editorial revisions have also been made to the Abstract at the Examiner's request. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and allowance of claims 1-14, 27-29 and 31-43.

Claim Objections

Formal objections have been made to claims 20 and 21. Claims 20 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, this rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-14, and 27-29, and 31-43 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections

Claims 15-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants traverse this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 15-26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. This rejection is, therefore, moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claims 15-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse this rejection. However, to move prosecution forward, claims 15-26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. This rejection is, therefore, moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claims 15-16, 19, 23, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hedrick et al. (US Patent No. 6,135,884, hereinafter "Hedrick"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to move prosecution forward, claims 15, 16, 19, 23, and 26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The rejection with respect to these claims is, therefore, moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Serial No. 09/661,930
Group Art Unit: 3714

Regarding claims 27 and 28, applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 27 is patentable. In particular, Hendrick fails to disclose or suggest multiple video display screens arranged at an obtuse angle to one another. Rather, Hendricks suggests mounting the displays on a "slant top" machine, which includes displays aligned at the same angle with respect to the player. For at least this reason, Hendrick does not anticipate claim 27. Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and is allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and allowance of claims 27 and 28.

Claims 1-14, 17-18, 20-22, 24-25, and 29-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding claim 1, Hendricks fails to disclose or suggest a pair of vertical support members extending upward from a top side of the computer enclosure. Rather, Hendricks discloses a rectangular structure having vertical members extending from the floor to the top of the gaming apparatus. *See e.g.* Figure 3d. For at least this reasons, Hendricks would not lead a person having ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claim 1. Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments as necessary. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and allowance of claims 1-14.

To move prosecution forward, claims 17, 18, 20-22, 24, and 25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. This rejection is therefore moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claims 29-32 depend from claim 27. As discussed above, Hendricks fails to disclose or suggest multiple video display screens arranged at an obtuse angle to one another. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Hendricks would not lead a person having skill in the art to the invention of claim 27. Claims 29-32 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection to these claims, and reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and allowance of claims 29-32.

Claims 33-43 have been newly added. Hendricks does not disclose or suggest a separate wager and prize unit from a computer enclosure. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 33-43 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request examination and allowance of claims 33-43.

Serial No. 09/661,930
Group Art Unit: 3714

Response to Examiner's Comments

Applicants respectfully assert that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made with regards to claims 1-14 and 29-32. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants respectfully assert that Hendricks does not suggest the desirability to make the necessary modifications to create a prima facie case of obviousness.

Applicants further note that neither case cited by the Examiner found such a motivation to modify in the prior art. Moreover, the *Jones* court noted that the PTO must show some evidence that the knowledge to modify was generally available. *See e.g. In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 351, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992)("Conspicuously missing from this record is any evidence, other than the PTO's speculation (if it can be called evidence) that one of ordinary skill in the...art would have been motivated to make the modifications [to the prior art]."); *In re Fine*, 837 F. 2d 1071, 1074-1075, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ("[W]hether a particular combination might be 'obvious to try' is not a legitimate test of patentability.").

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 18, 2005

Brian H. Batzli
Reg. No. 32,960

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE